DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 064 790 88 EA 004 462

TITLE	The Operation of a Center for Effecting Educational Change, Fairfax County, Virginia. End of Budget Report.
INSTITUTION	Fairfax County Schools, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	DPSC-67-3705
PUB DATE	24 Dec 69
NOTE	53p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Change; Educational Experiments; *Educational Innovation; Educational Planning; Educational Technology; Evaluation Methods; *Feasibility Studies; Fine Arts; Kindergarten; *Pilot Projects; *Program Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

This report provides statistical and narrative data on innovative projects and methods developed in Fairfax County's Center for Effecting Educational Change. These study activities focused on effecting changes in the kindergarten, child study, fine and performing arts, and educational technology programs. A broad outline provides an overview of the objectives and activities for each of the four study areas during the 1967-68 and the 1968-69 school years. Following the outline, specific program evaluations of the kindergarten, child study, and fine and performing arts project areas are reported. A description of the evaluation instruments and an on-site evaluation report are provided in the appendixes. (Author/JF)

ED 064790

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE OPERATION OF

A CENTER FOR EFFECTING EDUCATIONAL

CHANGE

FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

END OF BUDGET REPORT

project number DPSC 67-3705

EA 004 462

Submitted By
Fairfax County Public Schools
10700 Page Avenue
Fairfax, Virginia 22030
December 24, 1969

Fairfax County Public Schools

10700 Page Avenue, Fairfax, Virginia 22030 • Telephone 273-6500
L. M. Watts, *Division Superintendent*

Office of
The Division Superintendent

Division of Plans and Supplementary Centers
United States Office of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20202

Gentlemen:

I am enclosing for your consideration the Fairfax County Public Schools' "End of Budget Report" for OEG 3-7-673705-4517, The Center for Effecting Educational Change.

It has been both challenging and rewarding to the Fairfax County School system and to the CEEC staff to develop a systematic change procedure through innovative projects and methods under the auspices of USOE and the ESEA Title III grant.

We look forward, also, to a continuing program with the Virginia State Department of Education and Fairfax County Public Schools.

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Watts

Lawrence M. Watts
Division Superintendent

OE 4381 (REV 2-67)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
WASHINGTON D.C. 20202

BUDGET BUREAU NO. 51-R60(
APPROVAL EXPIRES 6/30/68

ESEA TITLE III STATISTICAL DATA
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10)

THIS SPACE FOR U.S.O.E. USE ONLY →	PROJECT NUMBER	VENDOR CODE	COUNTY CODE	REGION CODE	STATE ALLOTMENT

SECTION A - PROJECT INFORMATION

1. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM *(Check one)*

A [ ] INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT
B [ ] RESUBMISSION
C [ ] APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT
D [X] END OF BUDGET PERIOD REPORT

2. IN ALL CASES EXCEPT INITIAL APPLICATION. GIVE OE ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER

OEG-3-7-673705-4517

3. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT: *(Check one only)*

A [ ] INNOVATIVE
B [ ] EXEMPLARY
C [ ] ADAPTIVE

4. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY *(Check one or more)*

A [ ] PLANNING OF PROGRAM
B [ ] PLANNING OF CONSTRUCTION
C [ ] CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES
D [ ] OPERATION OF PROGRAM
E [ ] CONSTRUCTING
F [ ] REMODELING

5. PROJECT TITLE *(5 Words or Less)*

6. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND GIVE THE ITEM NUMBER OF THE AREA OF MAJOR EMPHASIS AS LISTED IN SEC. 303, P.L. 89-10. *(See instructions)*

ITEM NUMBER _____

7. NAME OF APPLICANT *(Local Education Agency)*	8. ADDRESS *(Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)*	
9. NAME OF COUNTY	10. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT	
11. NAME OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	12. ADDRESS *(Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)*	PHONE NUMBER / AREA CODE
13. NAME OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE GRANT *(Please type)*	14. ADDRESS *(Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)*	PHONE NUMBER / AREA CODE
Lawrence M. Watts	Fairfax County Public Schools 10700 Page Avenue Fairfax, Virginia 22030	691 2631 703

15. POSITION OR TITLE

Division Superintendent

SIGNATURE OF PERSON AUTHORIZED TO RECEIVE GRANT	DATE SUBMITTED
Lawrence M. Watts	Dec. 24, 1969

3
3

SECTION A – Continued

16. LIST THE NUMBER OF EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SERVED	17A. TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTIES SERVED _____ B. TOTAL NUMBER OF LEA'S SERVED _____ C. TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED _____	18. LATEST AVERAGE PER PUPIL ADA EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SERVED $ _____

SECTION B – TITLE III BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from item 2c below)

1.		PREVIOUS OE GRANT NUMBER	BEGINNING DATE *(Month, Year)*	ENDING DATE *(Month, Year)*	FUNDS REQUESTED
A.	Initial Application or Resubmission				$
B.	Application for First Continuation Grant				$
C.	Application for Second Continuation Grant				$
D.	Total Title III Funds				$
E.	End of Budget Period Report	OEG-3-7-673705-4517	7-1-68	8-31-69	

2. *Complete the following items only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested. Leave blank if not appropriate.*

A. *Type of function (Check applicable boxes)*

1 ☐ REMODELING OF FACILITIES 2 ☐ LEASING OF FACILITIES 3 ☐ ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES

4 ☐ CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES 5 ☐ ACQUISITION OF BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT

B. 1. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY _____	2. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS _____	C. AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY $ _____

SECTION C – SCHOOL ENROLLMENT, PROJECT PARTICIPATION DATA AND STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED

1.			PRE-KINDERGARTEN	KINDERGARTEN	GRADES 1 - 6	GRADES 7 - 12	ADULT	OTHER	TOTALS	STAFF MEMBERS ENGAGED IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR PROJECT
A	School Enrollment in Geographic Area Served	(1) Public		7,022	56,867	55,526	4,376	287	124,078	
		(2) Non-public		2,161	10,521	5,121			17,803	
B	Persons Served by Project	(1) Public		7,022	56,867	55,526			119,415	
		(2) Non-public		2,161	10,521	5,121			17,803	
		(3) Not Enrolled								
C	Additional Persons Needing Service	(1) Public								
		(2) Non-public								
		(3) Not Enrolled								

2. TOTAL NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS BY RACE *(Applicable to figures given in item 1B above)*	WHITE	NEGRO	AMERICAN INDIAN	OTHER NON-WHITE	TOTAL
	133,176	4,020	Unknown	22	137,218

SECTION C - continued

3. RURAL/URBAN DISTRIBUTION OF PARTICIPANTS SERVED OR TO BE SERVED BY PROJECT

PARTICIPANTS	RURAL		METROPOLITAN AREA		
	FARM	NON-FARM	CENTRAL-CITY	NON-CENTRAL CITY	OTHER URBAN
PERCENT OF TOTAL NUMBER SERVED				100	

SECTION D - PERSONNEL FOR ADMINISTRATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT

1. PERSONNEL PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF PAID PERSONNEL	REGULAR STAFF ASSIGNED TO PROJECT			NEW STAFF HIRED FOR PROJECT		
	FULL-TIME 1	PART-TIME 2	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 3	FULL-TIME 4	PART-TIME 5	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 6
A. ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION	10		10			
B. TEACHER:						
(1) PRE-KINDERGARTEN						
(2) KINDERGARTEN						
(3) GRADES 1-6						
(4) GRADES 7-12		4	.5			
(5) OTHER						
C. PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES						
D. OTHER PROFESSIONAL						
E. ALL NON-PROFSSIONAL	4		4			
F. FOR ALL CONSULTANTS PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS →	(1.) TOTAL NUMBER RETAINED _____			(2.) TOTAL CALENDAR DAYS RETAINED 4½		

2. PERSONNEL NOT PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS

TYPE OF UNPAID PERSONNEL	REGULAR STAFF ASSIGNED TO PROJECT			NEW STAFF HIRED FOR PROJECT		
	FULL-TIME 1	PART-TIME 2	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 3	FULL-TIME 4	PART-TIME 5	FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT 6
A. ADMINISTRATION/ SUPERVISION		10	1.0			
B. TEACHER:						
(1) PRE-KINDERGARTEN						
(2) KINDERGARTEN		15	1.5			
(3) GRADES 1 TO 6						
(4) GRADES 7-12	2		.2			
(5) OTHER						
C. PUPIL PERSONNEL SERVICES						
D. OTHER PROFESSIONAL						
E. ALL NON-PROFESSIONAL						
F. FOR ALL CONSULTANTS NOT PAID BY TITLE III FUNDS →	(1.) TOTAL NUMBER RETAINED _____			(2.) TOTAL CALENDAR DAYS RETAINED _____		

SECTION E - NUMBER OF PERSONS SERVED OR TO BE SERVED AND ESTIMATED COST DISTRIBUTION

MAJOR PROGRAM OR SERVICES	TOTAL NUMBER SERVED OR TO BE SERVED						NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PUPILS INCLUDED (7)	ESTIMATED COST (8)
	PRE-K (1)	K (2)	1-6 (3)	7-12 (4)	ADULT (5)	OTHER (6)		
EVALUATIVE PROGRAMS		7,022	56,867	55,526				25,036.00
A Deficiency Survey (Area Needs)								
B Curriculum Requirements Study (Including Planning for Future Need)								
C Resource Availability and Utilization Studies								
INSTRUCTION AND/OR ENRICHMENT				148				102,973.00
A Arts (Music, Theater, Graphics, Etc.)								
B Foreign Languages								
C Language Arts (English Improvement)								
D Remedial Reading								
E Mathematics								
F Science								
G Social Studies/Humanities								
H Physical Fitness/Recreation								
I Vocational/Industrial Arts								
J Special-Physically Handicapped								
K Special-Mentally Retarded								
L Special-Disturbed (Incl. Delinquent)								
M Special-Dropout								
N Special-Minority Groups								
INSTRUCTION ADDENDA								
A Educational TV/Radio								
B Audio-Visual Aids								
C Demonstration/Learning Centers								
D Library Facilities								
E Material and/or Service Centers								
F Data Processing								
PERSONAL SERVICES								
A Medical/Dental								
B Social/Psychological		470						48,655.25
OTHER MAP Study Record Examination		5,000						4,800.00

4/b 8

End of Budget Period Report

Part II Narrative Report

1. (a) For operational activities, discuss the effect of the project on the clientele by briefly stating the major objectives of the project and the techniques used in evaluating the extent to which these objectives were achieved. PACE project applicants are required to provide project evaluations. Please attach one copy of the results of this evaluation with supporting materials. Estimate the cost of the evaluation.

Fairfax County school personnel and citizens saw in the ESEA Title III Act opportunities to expand, improve, and modify existing programs and/or develop new programs. In February, 1966, they elected to apply for a planning, rather than an operational, grant. This would allow them to spend one year in analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of the educational and cultural needs of Fairfax County. The input obtained from the planning grant came from: (1) a basic survey of educational and cultural resources and existing programs in Fairfax County; (2) proposals and evaluations from the school staff and community as to needs in schools; (3) information on community interests and desires; (4) reviewing school accreditation reports for priorities; and (5) reviewing and analyzing statistical and evaluation information. As a result, five major need areas were identified, as follows:

- a capability to implement educational change by an orderly and systematic change procedure;
- an opportunity for planning, piloting, and evaluating kindergarten for county-wide implementation in 1968-69;
- a child study center to explore a variety of attendant needs;
- additional programs in fine and performing arts;
- expanded or initial use of instructional television, computers, and other educational technology.

As a result of the planning grant and information obtained, the School Board submitted a proposal and received a grant related to five priorities as a basis for operation. The Center For Effecting Educational Change (CEEC) began operations on July 1, 1967, to carry out the following general objectives:

1. to develop and initiate a systematic change procedure for effecting and evaluating educational change in Fairfax County
2. to research and analyze change and the change process
3. to provide special services related to educational innovation and evaluation to teachers and other professional staff members of public and non-public schools
4. to evaluate the implementation of new and/or revised programs in the four areas identified in planning grant by utilizing an educational team approach
5. to serve as an exemplary center for visitation, observation and study by educators and other interested individuals.

Each of the study areas (kindergarten, child study, fine and performing arts, and educational technology) would be developed on a three year cycle made up of the following major phases in initiating change:

Phase 1, Need and Feasibility Studies, conducted during the first year of any project to define the specific areas to be studied, to identify and assess the needs in the areas, to identify and assess the feasibility of developing the specific areas, and to identify and delineate the problems underlying the needs.

Phase II, Planning and Pilot Studies, conducted during the second year to actually implement the project on a "trial basis" at a sampling of schools to identify and assess needed human and material resources, strategies, including objectives and evaluation techniques to be employed, the procedural design for implementing the strategies, and, during the operation of the pilot project to identify the defects in the procedural design or its implementation, and, finally, to maintain a record of events and activities as well as to evaluate the outcome of the project.

Phase III, Implementation, during the third year of operation, to assess whether the project should be implemented into the regular school program, continued as an experimental program on a limited basis, or completely aborted.

The CEEC project study areas have had the following histories:

- Kindergarten

During the 1967-68 school year, the kindergarten project had to assume responsibility for Phase 1, Need and Feasibility Studies, and Phase 2, Planning and Pilot Studies, due to the fact that a system-wide kindergarten program was being planned for the 1968-69 school year. Last year the kindergarten project was merged with the diagnostic-prescriptive Child Study Project since both programs were directed at kindergarten children and the objectives of both programs could be coordinated and integrated to provide a more comprehensive approach. In addition, the coordinator of the kindergarten project was called upon by the local school system to assist with the implementation of the county-wide program and to provide continuing program review and evaluation support.

- Child Study

This project area underwent Phase 1, Need and Feasibility Studies, during the 1967-68 school year and arrived at ten recommendations for programs or studies. Two of these recommendations were funded last year--the diagnostic-prescriptive child study program and the educational profile study of Fairfax County--and were involved in Phase 2, Planning and Pilot Studies. As mentioned above, the Child Study Project was merged with the kindergarten program during the 1968-69 school year, a move which gained mutual advantage from a pooling of personnel, time, materials, and funds.

- Fine and Performing Arts

This project area also underwent Phase 1, Need and Feasibility Studies, during the 1967-68 school year and identified nine possible programs. Only two of these programs were funded. During the summer of

1968, the General Arts Exposure program for rising sixth grade pupils was conducted (Phase 2, Planning and Pilot Study) and during the school year of 1968-69 the Combined Film Arts Program, consisting of Film Study and Film Production classes, was conducted on the high school level (Phase 2, Planning and Pilot Study).

- Educational Technology

Last year this project underwent Phase 1, Need and Feasibility Studies, to identify and assess needs in the area of educational technology. This study included a review of the utilization and evaluation of technological facilities, technological services now being provided in the school system, and the need for educational technology for instructional programs. Areas such as educational and instructional television, programmed learning, dial access (retrieval) systems computer assisted instruction, and responder and other interaction systems were explored in depth. The major priority identified was a need for an instructional television system that would include individual school, closed-circuit television systems consisting of origination, distribution, storage, and playback functions; a Media Center augmentation of existing equipment to permit teacher training and limited production; and a short in-service summer program.

The following broad outlines provide an overview of the objectives and activities for each of the four study areas during the 1967-68 and 1968-69 school years:

KINDERGARTEN
1967-68

Objectives	Activities
1. To observe characteristics of Fairfax County five-year old children	1. Testing of each child by teacher or aide, including standardized tests and behavior inventory (See pages 20-26 of Monograph II)
2. To develop a broad outline in the academic and non-academic learnings 3. To determine appropriate activities for kindergarten children 4. To determine ways to individualize instruction at the kindergarten level	2., 3., and 4. a. In-depth exploration of individually selected curriculum areas by teachers of demonstration classes Each teacher wrote units, lessons, or curriculum suggestions for the curriculum committee b. Regular meetings of curriculum committee in winter and spring of 1968 and preparation of curriculum guide c. Curriculum workshop in June, 1968
5. To examine the effectiveness of varied instructional and diagnostic materials	5. a. Consultation with specialist in early childhood equipment b. Evaluation of equipment and material by each teacher as to availability, adequacy, suitability, and frequency of use c. Teacher evaluation of materials for specific instructional areas, indicating whether specific materials were essential, desirable, enriching, or of no value. (See pages 12 and 26-28 of Monograph II)
6. To determine the function of teacher aides and develop a system of in-service training for them	6. In-service meetings involving both teachers and aides, resulting in subsequent role definition. A survey instrument at end of year collected further data (See page 29 of Monograph II)
7. To assist parents in understanding the meaning of the kindergarten program and activities	7. Home-school relationships and communications as developed by each teacher Data was obtained at the end of the year regarding parent-teacher meetings, home visitations, and parent involvement

Objectives	Activities
8. To serve as demonstration centers for prospective teachers, aides, and other interested persons	8. Seven classrooms (one in a school in each of the existing seven magistrial districts of the county) were opened for purposes of observation and demonstration. Approximately 1,000 people visited the classrooms
9. To develop management routines	9. Management routines were worked out with respective departments in cooperation with CEEC, as follows: Directors of Food Services and Elementary Education - routines for snack in kindergarten Director of Maintenance and Plant Operation - custodial routines for cleaning of kindergarten classrooms during noontime break
10. To develop alternate plans for evaluation	10. This was partially fulfilled in certain sections of the evaluation of specific objectives, for example, both standardized and non-standardized instruments as well as teacher ratings were used in assessing the children's characteristics and also their achievement These data will serve as baseline data for future evaluations.

CHILD STUDY
1967-68

Objectives	Activities
1. 1967-68 Need and Feasibility Study	1. Meetings with public and non-public school personnel, representatives of community agencies and consultants 2. Analysis of Fairfax County Public Schools' test data and research reports Resultant recommendations: a. An operational program in the kindergartens of three to five schools to develop a diagnostic-corrective procedure for the purpose of forestalling later learning problems b. An operational program during the normal school year in one intermediate school, modeled in part after the Title I Language Arts and Social Studies Institute of the summers of 1965-66 and 1966-67 c. An operational program in one intermediate school utilizing a diagnostic-remedial team d. A study of the factors differentiating low- and high-achievers among children of below average intelligence, including those in the special education category e. A study of children who do not prove amenable to remedial reading f. A study of causes for drop-outs g. Development of an academic map of County schools and an exploration of factors which go into its make-up. Such a map could contribute to a more efficient deployment of personnel, materials, and programs to answer specific needs

Objectives	Activities
	h. Development of an integrated program of all levels at one elementary school, following an in-depth analysis of the needs of that school
	i. A study of the extent to which instruction is matched to the skill-level of students
	j. A study of methods to explore the teaching variable itself.

CHILD STUDY AND KINDERGARTEN
1968--69

Objectives	Activities
1. To further delineate the characteristics of the Fairfax County five year-old in the areas of motor development, visual-motor perception, auditory perception, concept formation, language development, and social and emotional development and to develop an aptitude profile for each child to serve as the basis for his "educational prescription"	1. Use of commercial and locally devised tests administered by teachers and aides. In two schools, the tests were administered by local psychologists and CEEC staff members
2. To design and develop a curriculum consisting of a series of sequential, corrective learning tasks for individual pupils that are supplementary to and/or substituted for the normal kindergarten program	2. Based upon needs pointed up by the diagnostic testing, an initial prescriptive curriculum designed to levelop cognitive and sensori-motor areas
3. To develop techniques for evaluating teacher-child interaction, including feedback to the teacher, in order to evolve a model for optimal teacher-pupil interaction and instructional effectiveness	3. Six hours of video tapes of the normal classroom situation. The tapes serve as: a. A vehicle for analyzing the teacher's diagnostic and instructional techniques (This analysis will serve as data for development of a model for optimal diagnostic and instructional techniques) b. A source of feedback to the teacher of her diagnostic and instructional techniques c. A source for study of individual children by the classroom teacher
4. To develop an end-of-year evaluation to serve as a basis for a teaching prescription for groups of pupils or for individual pupils for the following school year	4. Profile of the test scores on each child to be furnished to his school in order to serve as data for his next teacher and the following information to be gathered by CEEC or the schools: a. A teacher rating scale of the child's end-of-year achievement in those areas taped by the diagnostic testing b. End-of-year testing of a sample of the total population carried out to assess the agreement of

Objectives	Activities
	4. b. (cont) teacher ratings and post-test scores. This will also afford a measure of the differences between the pre- and post-test scores
5. To develop in-service approaches which are meaningful to the teachers and which bring about improvements in teaching	5. Activities involved: a. General pre- and in-service training for teachers and aides b. In-service training on diagnostic testing conducted by a consultant and the CEEC staff c. Development of a video tape on testing the 5 year-old d. Development of instruments for evaluating teacher opinion as to the effectiveness of pre-school training
6. To develop organization-management routines related to storage and use of equipment and supplies	6. Development of an instrument for assessing the continuing patterns of utilization of equipment and materials

CHILD STUDY
EDUCATIONAL PROFILE

Objectives	Activities
1967-68	
1. Need and Feasibility Study	1. See Child Study, Item g.
1968-69	
1. To identify three representative schools (elementary intermediate, and secondary)	1. The three schools were selected on the basis of representativeness, geographic location, and cooperativeness. Meetings were held with necessary school personnel to explain the program and elect their cooperation.
2. To collect quantifiable information on all variables related to pupil performance	2. An analysis of the school cumulative folders was made to identify available data
3. To design and develop a method for the collection and tabulation of such information	3. a. Optical scanning sheets were designed to permit data collection in a form compatible with computer use. b. Personnel were trained to collect data using the scan sheets.

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

1967-68

Objectives	Activities
1. To assess needs in existing programs in fine and performing arts and to project future needs in existing areas and undeveloped areas	1. a. Selection and organization of Fine and Performing Arts Study Area Team composed of teachers, administrators, professional artists, community leaders, CEEC staff members b. Identification of needs and feasible programs to meet these needs (Nine possible programs were originally outlined by this team and its sub committees)
2. To develop pilot programs designed to feasibly meet some of the identified needs	2-3 Selection and refinement of project proposals in 1. Combined Film Arts (a) Film Study (b) Film Production 2. Combined Arts Exposure (a 6 week summer program involving integration of art forms)
3. To develop methods of integrating art forms in a single activity	3. Elementary In-Service Program In Arts (summer and school year workshops to increase arts competence of elementary classroom teacher)

1968-69

4. To evaluate existing measurement devices related to arts and experiment with new forms for measuring arts potential	4. Development of seven measurement devices for administration to all students in pilot programs and control groups not involved in pilot classes; preparation of factor analyses to assess and evaluate relative value of new and standardized forms
5. To evaluate equipment, supplies and curriculum materials appropriate for pilot studies	5. Development of curriculum guides or core units through inservice workshops with teachers and recommendations of program consultants

Objectives	Activities
6. To identify possible alternate approaches to meeting objectives of Fine and Performing Arts project	6. Identification of research programs and pilot programs such as: 1. action on previous research for priority implementation 2. outline purposes for integrated arts
7. To develop project reports and report research findings	7. Preparation of articles, monographs, video and audio tape productions and live presentations relative to project work
8. To provide advisory assistance in operational school programs	8. Consultations with administrators, teachers, students, and community representatives relative to existing and planned operational school programs

PROJECTED PROGRAM
EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The program will provide an instructional television system within selected Fairfax County Public Schools and the Instructional Media Center designed to allow the flexibility and control necessary to permit multi-purpose study and evaluation. Major system elements will include individual school closed circuit television systems consisting of origination, distribution, storage, and playback functions; a Media Center augmentation of existing equipment to permit teacher training and limited production; and a short in-service summer program.

Specific Objectives

a. To research, develop, and apply instructional applications of closed circuit television systems to the Fairfax County Public Schools.

b. To investigate in-service uses of such systems for teacher self-appraisal, interaction analysis, and observation of learner behaviors.

c. To explore the expansion of learning experiences and the educational environment through distributive, creative, and extracurricular uses of closed circuit television.

d. To generate cost and operational experience data suitable for planning, programming, and cost effectiveness study.

e. To identify and utilize evaluation procedures and instruments to measure the applications of closed circuit television to achieve the objectives listed above.

Activities to achieve objectives

a. Conduct a need and feasibility study to determine priorities, establish time and resource limitations, and develop and narrow possible courses of action to achieve objectives.

b. Survey literature, reports of relevant experience of other school systems, developments in technology appropriate to the needs, and identify and seek out consultants and other external sources which may contribute to the selection of the most effective and feasible alternatives.

c. Prepare initial program input including plan, objectives, research design and evaluation schema subject to revision, modification, or recycling as additional information and environmental changes dictate. Include preliminary cost estimates and other feasibility guidelines.

d. Conduct coordination and planning meetings with local system personnel.

e. Determine facilities requirements, space, modifications and select participating schools.

f. Determine equipment requirements and specifications, surveys and select sources, order and obtain delivery

g. Plan and conduct in-service program for participating teachers and coordinators (14 days).

Specific Objectives	Activities to achieve objectives
	h. Initiate and conduct pilot program, supervise, observe and coordinate
	i. Implement continuous and interim evaluation procedures during the period of the program and conduct final evaluation
	j. Collect, analyze and evaluate data obtained from the program. Report and disseminate findings and recommendations.

Specific program evaluations of the three operational project areas--Kindergarten, Child Study, and Fine and Performing Arts--are contained in the following reports which accompany this fiscal year report:

- Factorial Studies of Curriculum and Evaluation, Fine and Performing Arts
- A perspective on Integrated Arts Courses
- A Survey of the D. C. District American Educational Theatre Association Conference
- Child Study-Kindergarten, 1968-69: An Information Report
- An Evaluative Report: The Oak View School Building
- An Item-Analysis Approach to Using Standardized Tests in Kindergarten
- Interview With Mr. Larry Hammonds, Teacher of Art in the 1968 Summer Arts Program
- An Interview with Miss Carolyn Johnston, Teacher of Dance in the 1968 Summer Arts Program

2. Briefly describe project endeavors in which the anticipated results have exceeded expectations, and those in which results have not measured up to expectations.

A number of CEEC activities are worthy of mention as exceeding expectations

- CEEC has been afforded an unusual opportunity to initiate innovative programs and projects in a variety of areas, an opportunity which would not have been possible without federal, state, and local support.
- Development of a change procedure strategy for planning, developing, and evaluating educational programs in a systematic manner is beginning to have a definite effect on the local school system.
- Establishment of a team approach, using the unique talents of psychologists, evaluators, curriculum specialists, educational technologists, and administrators in planning, developing, and evaluating instructional programs, has produced significant results.
- As an exemplary center, CEEC has received numerous requests for information and studies and countless visitors from within the country and state, and throughout the country; and has generated very real interest and excitement in regard to its concepts and project areas.
- Individual school staffs, as well as central and area administrative staffs, have recognized and requested the consultative services of the CEEC staff.
- The local school board has expressed a willingness to accept Center concepts. Various community organizations, particularly the League of Women Voters, have also expressed a willingness to accept center concepts and phase the Center into the local school system operation.
- Staffing of the Center has included a mixture of personnel from existing school departments, to insure a knowledge of the school system, and from outside the school system. This mixture has had a positive effect on the

quality of intellectual inquiry. The inclusion of an information specialist has proven to be invaluable to the Center.

. Specific project activities which have exceeded expectations include the following:

- Model for Program Planning and Budgeting System (Monograph III: Planning For Educational Change: PPBS), whose first printing is exhausted.
- SPEC Evaluation Model and Systematic Change Procedure Model, which has been recognized as an asset in planning, developing, and evaluating instructional programs
- The Kindergarten Evaluation Reports (1967-68) and the Analysis of School Self-Study Report and Evaluation Schema, which gained national recognition
- The eminently successful Middle Atlantic Dissemination Conference, which CEEC co-sponsored
- Child Study-Kindergarten Report (1968-69), just recently published and already drawing many requests
- Integrated Arts Courses, given acceptance and recognition by the American Educational Theater Association
- Film Study and Film Production programs, which have gained local school support
- Art Factorial Studies of Curriculum and Evaluation
- An Evaluation Report: The Oak View School Building

Those areas in which results have not measured up to expectations include the following:

. The original procedure for introducing change, i.e., need and feasibility studies, pilot studies, and implementation, was projected for a three-year period. This span of time is not practicable for all programs.

- Although objectives and procedures could be changed--and according to procedure should have been changed whenever evaluation so indicated--the lack of time resulting from processing of grants, etc., made such shifts of direction extremely unfeasible. This curtailment of time also allowed little, if any, possibility of planning with groups after the grants were made.
- In the beginning, the impression somehow got abroad that the Center held the purse strings to unlimited funds and that these could be allocated for any, all-inclusive studies. When it was realized that this was not the case, it became doubly difficult to promote the main concepts of the Center's major projects.
- The Center dealt primarily with new programs for Fairfax County; as a result, the staff found little opportunity to evaluate the effect of existing programs or problems within the school system or schools.
- Barriers were created as a result of bringing together a group of highly skilled people and giving them the opportunity to systematically introduce change and innovation in the various curriculum areas without solving existing problems of other very busy professionals.
- The three-year period of the grant will be too short for completing the various phases involved in a project as sophisticated as the Center was designed to be.
- The original concept was built on the premise of an increase in allocation of funds in both the second and third years of operation. Instead, successive fiscal year's allocations brought substantial decreases in funds, with obvious consequences.
- Uncertainty regarding funds kept the Center from an orderly planning of programs.
- The Center was caught between local and state/federal line item limitations in budgeting and was forced to operate on funds for specific items which were lower than allocations for local use.

- Being an innovative project, the Center required specific equipment for analysis and evaluation in its various programs. Local policy, however, required the Center to go through both school and county finance departments and, also, to get bids on equipment and supplies, a procedure which severely limited operational time in certain cases or prevented programs from using equipment desired in the studies.
- At least half of the staff came from the Fairfax system, and, consequently, were fully aware of the need for studies in many areas. This made it extremely difficult for them to refuse services when requested and, in some instances, resulted in an almost unmanageable work load.
- As personnel coming from the local school, also, these members of CEEC found their freedom of action inhibited when they had to deal with former administrators and supervisors.

In addition, there were other special problems encountered such as:

- The CEEC staff did not reach the proposed staff strength outlined in the original grant, and the turnover of top level administrators created problems of priorities and direction. This prohibited fulfillment of the original objectives and ordered an overlapping of responsibilities.
- County growth and staff work load does not permit in-depth involvement by the local staff. Keeping up is a tremendous accomplishment in itself. The CEEC innovative approach added to the concern load of very busy people, and their mode of operation as compared to the Center's created barriers in planning and development activities. Barriers of this type will naturally be encountered, but the fact that Center activities did not solve existing problems created a permanent block. Perhaps some of this can be attributed to what appears to be an unrealistic three year time proposal in need and feasibility study, planning and pilot, and implementation by the system.

- Top level communication and coordination between CEEC and the division was never outlined nor an operating procedure established before the program began or as the program progressed. Attempts were made to accomplish this type of structure, but it never reached an understood operational level. The failure cannot be placed on any one individual or group. Perhaps the complicated operational structure of this huge system was too involved for an operation of such short duration.
- Most of the above problems can be directly related to lack of finances, and many were created because of finances. The original grant called for increasing funds as the Center moved from year to year. Fund allocation, however, was on a completely inverted basis and has created the major problem of the Center. Initial involvement became too sophisticated to change markedly because of a reduction in funds, and the result has been to "water down" all programs, staff, and involvement as funds were not appropriated.
- The Center was created and operated at a time when the school division was facing problems of a massive decentralization which called for new methods of operation, means of communication, and uncertainties regarding both. In addition, the division superintendent announced his resignation during the middle of the grant period.
- For the first two years of operation the notification of grant awards were delayed until the last minute, thereby, making it impossible to concretely initiate programs under consideration.
- Within the course of two years, the Center's offices were moved three times. The moves naturally cut into an already tight schedule while offices were arranged, telephones connected, and necessary equipment assembled. Also, each move found the Center further removed geographically from the central administrative offices, the school system's operational hub.

- The approaching terminal point for the Center and the uncertainty regarding job prospects creates anxiety for the staff and makes it difficult to maintain enthusiasm and momentum.

3. Report the effect of the project on the educational institution or agency by discussing what you consider to be the greatest change resulting from the project.

The Fairfax County School Board approved $58,000 of local funds for the absorption of a portion of costs of the CEEC operation during the 1968-69 school year. This sum was allocated because of the decrease in funds granted by the federal government and the state under Title III ESEA at a time when the Center had completed only one year of operation. Although the local allotment was cut completely due to a very tight school system budget, it provided evidence that the local school board, the superintendent, and the instructional staff supported and accepted CEEC concepts and program activities. It is anticipated that this acceptance will continue and that specific components of the CEEC program will be absorbed by the school system in the future.

The CEEC kindergarten program framework served as a jumping-off point in planning and implementing the 1968-69 county-wide program for 8,200 children. Research, planning, and development activities derived from the original pilot program provided the local instructional staff with invaluable data and information. A county-wide survey of the 1968-69 kindergarten program revealed that the program had been implemented very effectively and CEEC had been particularly instrumental in this process. This same survey also indicated that there were specific instructional areas that needed further study.

Child study programs have generated a tremendous amount of interest in the participating schools. The diagnostic-prescriptive program, with its emphasis on early diagnosis and prescriptive instructional programs for individual children, has been well received throughout the school system. The educational profile project, with its emphasis on developing an academic map of county schools which could further a more efficient deployment of personnel, materials, and programs to answer specific school needs, has tremendous implications for planning

and development of programs on a county-wide and area-wide basis and has been so received by central and area office supervisors and administrators.

The Fine and Performing Art programs have encountered the most resistance from the central office staff, probably because they cut across many disciplines such as art, music, and English in the present school organizational structure. The General Arts Exposure program for elementary pupils, which provided opportunities for participation in art, dance, drama, music, and combinations of the four areas, was well received by the teachers and pupils. The county-wide supervisor of music stated in the annual report on curriculum and instruction that, "the summer arts program of 1968 was excellent." Film study and production classes have been well received by local school administrators, teachers, and pupils.

A systematic procedure for effecting change is imperative in a fast growing system like Fairfax County, where change is a way of life. Instructional staff members have recognized and are beginning to use many of the Center's models in planning, developing, and evaluating instructional programs. The most recent model on PPBS has been extremely well received by the central office staff and as a result members of CEEC were invited to participate in the initial planning of a PPBS pilot program for the 1969-70 school year. Other school systems have sent representatives to the Center to discuss various models with staff members and numerous school systems have requested printed information on change and evaluation models.

The numerous requests received at CEEC for consultative evaluative and technical assistance regarding a variety of instructional areas indicate that the Center is providing special services to central, area, and school staffs. A case in point was the request by the Associate Superintendent and the Elementary School Study Plant Committee for an evaluation of the new Oak View elementary school building.

It is still too early to determine the total effect that CEEC has had or

will have in the future on the Fairfax County school system. The CREC staff believes that it will take five to six years to objectively assess our impact. Our impressions at this time are that we have created an awareness of the need for systematic procedures in planning, implementation, research and evaluation, and dissemination. The Center's primary objective will have been achieved if we can stimulate both school and lay personnel to think about concepts and practices that make instructional programs more efficient, effective, and productive. If this can be accomplished, regardless of whether the gains are credited to the Center or some department or person, the three years of operation will have been successful.

4. Report the effect of the project on the co-operating agencies by (1) listing all the community agencies that co-operated in the project; (2) discussing the results of such co-operation; and (3) listing local educational agencies and counties which were served by the project and indicate any changes since the initial application.

The CEEC Citizens Advisory Committee is composed of representatives from various active community agencies who act as "linkage agents" between the community and CEEC and the local instructional staff. (Appendix A) The role and responsibility of the Citizens Advisory Committee has changed, as programs have become operational, on the approval of the local school administration and the Committee, itself. To continue to provide feedback to the Committee, CEEC has invited its members to visit the Center at their convenience, arranged for the Committee and other interested agencies and individuals to attend presentations, and sought suggestions concerning project areas. The League of Women Voters, in particular, has requested meetings with the total CEEC staff for the past two years to keep abreast of our activities. This continuing communication has resulted in the League supporting CEEC activities, as well as recommending to the school board that the Center continue beyond the grant period.

In addition, individual CEEC staff members in the course of their program activities have direct contact with the Fairfax County instructional staff, various parochial and private school in the county, local mental health centers, the local juvenile and domestic relations court, and other related community agencies and individuals.

The Center's Kindergarten-Child Study Program involved a cooperative working relationship with Dr. Mark Ozer of Children's Hospital, Washington, D. C., which resulted in a neurological test developed by Dr. Ozer being used as part of the pupil assessment battery. Local pediatricians also participated in this project by administering the neurological test to pupils in a sample of four

schools participating in the CEEC program. In another part of this project, discussions with the County Health Department explored the possibility of co-operative pre-school assessments of children, with further study projected for the future.

In another community activity, this time during American Education Week, CEEC offered exhibits of its publications and a series of video television programs which played continuously during the week the exhibit was at the Tysons Corner Shopping Center, a large and newly opened complex. Copies of CEEC publications were provided to persons who requested them and a series of personal interviews, based on questions designed to solicit both positive and negative responses, about education in Fairfax County, were conducted with visitors. Findings were tabulated by the community analyst and made available in a narrative report.

Another activity which affected the Fairfax County and Washington, D. C. area, was the joint Middle Atlantic Dissemination Conference, held in conjunction with Title III offices in the states of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. CEEC was charged with the major responsibility for planning and implementing the conference program. Local school and community personnel in the metropolitan Washington area were given the opportunity to attend this important conference. Fairfax County was represented by school board and Citizens Advisory Committee members during the three-day conference.

5. Discuss how project information was disseminated. Include such information as (1) the number of unsolicited requests for information; (2) the number of visitors from outside the project area; and (3) the estimated costs of such dissemination.

While dissemination has followed general outlines laid down in previous years, certain dissemination activities and products received special emphases. These, quite naturally, involved information of special use to teachers and administrators.

The first monograph, The Change Process and the Fairfax County Schools, discussed "the dynamics of educational change," specifically in relation to county schools. This monograph, authored by the curriculum analyst and an evaluation specialist at CEEC, was the product of considerable discussion and thought and since then has constituted a tap root of other thinking about change and the design of change models. The monograph was not intended as a work which could be used by teachers but was aimed at other persons in the system who might be concerned with change, at change specialists generally, and at university personnel.

As far as the local school is concerned, general reaction to Monograph I was disappointing. Despite great effort to translate terms into immediately usable references, the monograph apparently was considered so esoteric as to require more time for translation than most school people were free to give. Since its first appearance, however, the Center has received some fifty letters about the monograph--many of them from school systems or agencies trying to get a grasp on change concepts--which indicate that its usefulness is in no way questionable. It also contributed to Monograph III, which concerns CEEC change models and program-planning-budgeting in schools.

The second monograph, The Change Process in Action: Kindergarten, apparently met a real need. It contained about a third of the material contained in

a report of CEEC's demonstration kindergarten program, 1968-69, and enjoyed immediate and widespread response. The first printing was exhausted in a matter of several months. Since then, because of the expense involved in the second printing, the Center has charged $1.00 a copy for the close to 175 copies that have been requested. Requests have come from all over the United States and mentions of the brochure have appeared in several publications.

Following Monograph II, CEEC published Monograph III, Planning for Educational Change: PPBS. That printing is now exhausted and we are considering an additional printing to meet some one hundred recent requests including a request for a large number of copies by the American Association of School Administrators (AASA).

A first venture in a new newsletter format was made in October, 1968. The CEEC editor took pictures and wrote or edited the copy. Various staff members contributed material. The newsletter, intended for local consumption, constituted a good lesson in what not to do in dissemination if one is eager to spread the gospel of evaluated innovation and systematic change.

Since that time, an entirely new approach has been adopted. In April 1969, we changed our newsletter format to a quarterly journal of educational ideas entitled Education Strategy and Practice (ESP). Teachers throughout the system, who want to share their own instructional techniques or ideas, are invited to contribute to the journal. We have established two committees, a dissemination committee composed of CEEC staffers with various skills, and an editorial committee composed of representatives from various units and departments of the schools. In addition to publishing news about CEEC and CEEC research, ESP answers a Fairfax County need of disseminating information concerning innovative practices by County teachers, generally.

Evaluation of dissemination generally seems just as important as evaluation of other project activities. In this connection, another activity

to which the Center directed an all-out effort, was the Mid Atlantic Dissemination Conference, January 28-30, 1969. Joining in sponsoring this activity were the states of Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. Evaluations by 350 conference attenders, including people from California and the Virgin Islands, indicates the meeting was a very real success. A balance in the conference treasury will hopefully lead to further dissemination endeavors. The CEEC editor, also, prepared a 40-page report of conference presentations, which are being serialized by PACEreport.

Dissemination activities of the Center have brought hundreds of requests for reports and materials produced in the Center, although the size of our local system (129,979) limits the amount of our dissemination plans to state and national populations. However, such reports and materials as the following have received state and national recognition:

- Kindergarten 1967-68: An Evaluative Report and the Change Process In Action: Kindergarten (Croft Educational Service's Curriculum Letter)
- Educational Strategy and Practices, an educational journal (PACEreport)
- Planning For Educational Change: PPBS (American Association For School Administrators)
- Perspective On Integrated Art Courses (American Educational Theater Association)
- Analysis of Self-Study Reports and Recommended Evaluation Schema For County-wide Analysis (Croft Educational Services Curriculum Letter)

Dissemination, in addition to publication of various materials, during 1968-69 included a radio presentation, video tape presentations, including an exhibit during American Education Week, and presentations by various staff members before specific audiences. In this connection, the coordinators of the various subject area projects within CEEC made appearances before teachers' and university groups, school meetings, and PTA meetings.

The Center, in addition, has hosted a number of visits from both persons

outside and inside the County. In this respect, we have enjoyed particularly noteworthy rapport and support from the Fairfax County League of Women Voters, who were kind enough to send a letter to the School Board petitioning a permanent role for CEEC, or a comparable organization within the system.

6. Describe the methods and procedures being developed to carry the project forward without Federal support after the designated approval period.

The following methods and procedures have been developed to carry the project forward without federal support after the designated approval period:

- The Center staff submitted the budget for the 1969-70 school year to the local school board, indicating how the proposed reduction in Title III funds would affect our operation. A proposal for beginning an absorption of the basic CEEC concept and financial needs for this was also presented. The school board and the Division Superintendent reacted by granting the following: (A) $58,000 in operating funds (which was later cut out due to budget limitations); (B) three teachers on extended contracts for use in the Child Study and Fine and Performing Arts programs; (C) necessary office and overhead expense; and (D) continued use of local school facilities where CEEC projects are operating.
- The Center staff this year has also submitted a budget for the 1970-71 school year, which allows for continuation of all CEEC projects and offers various alternate approaches for continuation, and is awaiting the school board and Superintendent's reaction. This budget proposal was prepared at the request of the Superintendent.
- In recent months the Superintendent has assigned to the Center specific instructional programs and responsibilities that suggest continuation of CEEC activities, with special emphasis on providing special services in the form of evaluative, consultative, technical and editorial assistance to the total school system.
- The amount of CEEC absorption into the school division will ultimately rest with decision-makers on the school board, the Superintendent, and top instructional personnel and will be based upon their individual perceptions of how valuable CEEC project activities and studies have

been to the school system. Another factor that will influence absorption is the amount of available funds remaining after other priority instructional areas have been funded.

Part III Financial

As of this date, a few items in our budget for 1968-69 remain outstanding. These bills are in the process of being paid, but final payment has not cleared through Fairfax County. At the time all bills have cleared, we will send this final portion of our End-of-Budget Report.

APPENDIX A

CEEC CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Name and Address	Organization Represented
Mr. Earl S. Christman, Jr. 6531 Columbia Pike Annandale, Virginia 22003	Fairfax Division, Council of Churches of Greater Washington
Mrs. Lois Czapiewski 6438 Fairland Street Alexandria, Virginia 22312	Burgundy Farms Country Day School
Mr. Warren Dahlstrom 9824 Hampton Lane Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Fairfax County Council of Parent-Teacher Associations
Mr. Douglas W. Dalton 6004 Brandon Avenue Springfield, Virginia 22150	FEA and Reading Coordinator
Mrs. Eleanor P. Godfrey 3403 Surrey Lane Falls Church, Virginia 22042	Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Association
Mrs. Constantia Johnson 7012 Woodland Drive Springfield, Virginia	Weyanoke School
Mrs. C. L. Karr, Jr. 3211 Traveler Street Fairfax, Virginia 22030	League of Women Voters, Fairfax Area
Mr. Albert D. Leary 6624 Columbia Pike Annandale, Virginia 22003	(Director, Leary School) Northern Virginia Private School Association
Mrs. John W. McDonald 4241 Chain Bridge Road Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Citizens Mental Health Committee of Fairfax City, Fairfax County and Falls Church
Dr. Thistle McKee 3800 Burgundy Road Alexandria, Virginia	Academy of Pediatrics
Mrs. Elsie Moore 238 Talahi Road, S.W. Vienna, Virginia 22180	CAP
Mrs. William A. Plissner 7315 Beechwood Drive Springfield, Virginia 22150	School Board
Mr. Malcolm Rigby 5816 22nd Street, N. Arlington, Virginia 22205	Cooperative School for Handicapped Children-Springfield

Name and Address	Organization Represented
Mrs. Kathryn Jane Ripley 202 N. Cherry Street Falls Church, Virginia 22046	Northern Virginia Community College
Mr. James Tierney 6918 Espey Lane McLean, Virginia 22101	Parochial Schools
Mr. Robert Trayhern 1923 Valley Wood Road McLean, Virginia 22101	McLean Ballet
Sister Barbara Webken 3300 Glen Carlyn Road Falls Church, Virginia 22041	Parochial School
Mr. William L. Whitesides 3915 Chain Bridge Road Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Assistant Director Fairfax County Public Library
Mr. Merrill Whitman 3300 Old Lee Highway Fairfax, Virginia 22030	Fairfax City School Board
Mrs. George Wright 8629 Polk Street McLean, Virginia 22101	League of Women Voters
Mr. Dean Brundage 980 Millwood Road Great Falls, Virginia	Northern Virginia Center University of Virginia
Mr. William R. Perlik 1249 Daleview Drive McLean, Virginia 22101	School Board
Mr. John A. Goldsmith 4605 Franconia Road Alexandria, Virginia 22310	School Board

APPENDIX B

Evaluation Activities: To illustrate the amount of time and effort that has been provided for evaluation activities the following outline is offered for perusal.

CHILD STUDY AND KINDERGARTEN

1. Questionnaires or instruments developed for use by participants in the project.

    1. Adaptation of Gesell Copy Forms
    2. Interview
    3. Writing Name and Letters
    4. Writing Numbers
    5. Lateral Dominance Test
    6. Kindergarten Parent Inventory
    7. Kindergarten Inventory
    8. Early Childhood Behavior Rating Scale
    9. Principal's Survey of the Implementation of the Kindergarten Program
    10. Teacher's Survey of the Implementation of the Kindergarten Program
    11. Kindergarten-Child Study Observational Scale
    12. Kindergarten Equipment Utilization Scale
    13. Kindergarten Teachers and Aides Data Sheet
    14. Kindergarten Audio-Visual Survey Form
    15. Survey of Teachers and Aides Perceptions of Pre-Service Programs Conducted by CEEC
    16. Kindergarten Materials Rating Scale
    17. Survey of the Role of Aides in Pilot Kindergarten Programs
    18. Inventory of Factors Affecting The Kindergarten Programs
    19. Survey of School-Community Relations in the Pilot Kindergarten Programs
    20. Parent Survey of the Home-School Relationship
    21. Survey of Use of Video Tapes for Pre- and In-Service

22. Kindergarten Enrollment-Attendance

23. Surveys of the Perceptions of Principals and Teachers in the Kindergarten Programs

24. Kindergarten Report Card

2. Standardized commercial tests administered

1. Draw-A-Man Test

2. Wide Range Achievement Test

3. Metropolitan Readiness Test

4. Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception

5. Neurological Evaluation, Form A (Dr. Mark Ozer, Children's Hospital, Washington, D. C.)

6. Schaefer Behavioral Inventory

7. Wann-Robison Reading Test

8. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test

9. Templin-Darley Tests of Articulation

10. Wechsler Sentences Test (WPPSI)

11. Wechsler Vocabulary Test (WPPSI)

12. Digit Retention Test (Binet)

13. Wechsler Primary-Pre-School Scale of Intelligence

14. Science Research Associate Tests (4th and 6th)

15. Lorge Thorndike Intelligence (2nd, 4th, and 6th)

16. California Test of Mental Maturity (7th)

17. Iowa Silent Reading Test (7th)

18. School and College Ability Test (9-12)

19. Sequential Test of Education Progress (9-12)

20. Differential Aptitude Test (8th)

FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS

1. Questionnaires or instruments developed for use by participants in the project.

    1. Multiple Arts Task Rating Scale
    2. Field Trip Questionnaire
    3. Summer Arts Course Questionnaire
    4. Teacher Questionnaire on Summer Arts Program
    5. Class Rating Scale
    6. Modern Dance Perception Test
    7. Multiple Arts Survey
    8. Questionnaire on Arts Identity
    9. Arts Information Sheet
    10. Interest Ranking Inventory
    11. Student Permanent Record Inventory
    12. Survey of Fine and Performing Arts in Fairfax County Public Schools
    13. Survey of D. C. District American Educational Theatre Association Conference
    14. D N Preference Scale

2. Standardized commercial tests administered

    1. Meier Art Judgment Test
    2. Design Judgment Test (Graves) (Condensed)
    3. Torrance Test of Creative Thinking (Modified and condensed)
    4. Mass-media Rorschach Test
    5. Emotional Projection Test (Modified and condensed)
    6. Seashore Test of Musical Ability (Modified and Condensed)
    7. Abbreviated Weshsler-Belleview Scale for Children
    8. Kuder Vocational Preference Inventory
    9. Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes (SSHA)
    10. Stock Sentence-Completion Test

APPENDIX C

THE STAFF OF THE CENTER

FOR EFFECTING EDUCATIONAL CHANGE

Present Staff 1969-70

Dr. George G. Tankard, Jr.	Director and Assistant Superintendent for Research and Program Development
Dr. Ronald A. Dearden	Acting Assistant Director
Dr. John Nickols	Curriculum Analyst
Dr. Richard J. Schillo	Study Area Supervisor for Child Study
Mr. John F. Duncan	Study Area Supervisor for Fine and Performing Arts
Mr. Frank J. Moore	Study Area Supervisor for Educational Technology
Mrs. Dorsey Baynham	Information Specialist
Dr. Newell D. Myers	Community Analyst
Miss Linda Snyder	Research Assistant
Mrs. Agnes McGovern	Administrative Assistant

Previous Staff 1967-69

Mr. W. Jack Tennant	Assistant Director (1968-69)
Dr. Charles Bertram	Change Specialist (1968-69)
Dr. Robert Kelly	Associate Director (1967-68)
Mr. Lawrence Sawyer	Assistant Director (1967-68)

Appendix D

ON-SITE EVALUATION REPORT

Date: May 29, 1969
Project: Fairfax - Center for Effecting Educational Change
Team: Don F. Gobble, Assistant Supervisor, Title III, ESEA, State Department of Education
Mrs. Callie Shingleton, Assistant Supervisor, Elementary Education, State Department of Education
Dr. John Petty, Lynchburg College

On May 29, the evaluation team visited the Title III project in Fairfax County for the purpose of conducting an on-site evaluation.

The team met with Dr. George Tankard, Mr. Jack Tennant and all other CEEC staff members. In the morning session the philosophy, objectives and activities were outlined to give the team an overall picture of the project. In the afternoon, team members separated and talked with individual staff members to obtain a broader understanding of each phase of the project. Although the team realizes that a one day visit is not sufficient time in which to do an in-depth evaluation, they are favorably impressed with many facets of the program.

Team consensus is that project activities are appropriate to and directed toward the achievement of stated objectives. An above average rating is given to objectives being related to the identified needs of students and teachers. An average rating is given to the project calendar being carefully planned well in advance of activity deadlines.

In regard to in-service activities the following categories are rated as indicated.

1. Teachers and teacher aides receiving professional training to improve their classroom competencies. Above-average
2. Teachers are involved in planning the activities of the project. Average
3. Administrative and supervisory personnel are involved in planning project activities. Above-average

Dissemination of information explaining project objectives and activities is considered above average. A good variety of media has been used and the information is factual and appropriate for many different audiences. We feel certain that the fine job that is being done in dissemination will aid tremendously in obtaining continuation funds from the local level after Title III funds are exhausted.

The team feels the cost of the project is justified by the number of people served. It appears that community interest in school programs has been increased by some of the project activities. The collecting and recording of data emerging from project activities is rated excellent. It is difficult to determine the project's influence on the philosophy of the total school program but it seems the project has, and will continue to, stimulate growth and change in the division.

Project administration and coordination seems to be strong. The following ratings were given.

1. The project director makes regularly scheduled progress reports to the Superintendent and School Board. Above average.

2. The project director has coordinated the activities of the project with those of the total instructional program. Above average

3. The local school division has made a financial commitment to the project from its initiation and increased its contribution annually. Above average

4. The professional staff of the State Department of Education has been used as a resource in project activities. Below average

5. Project staff is available as needed. Above average

6. Financial reports are up-to-date and in good order. Above average

In conclusion the team wishes to commend all project staff members for their enthusiasm and dedication. It is refreshing to see a realistic approach to educational change. The only recommendations that the team feels it can offer at this time, due to the projects broad scope of activities, are:

1. That greater use be made of State Department personnel as resource persons in planning various activities.

2. That every possible effort be made to communicate effectively with all school personnel so that the full value of the changes can be implemented to the greatest advantage for all the children.